DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 531 CS 001 453

AUTHOR Manzo, Anthony V., Ed.; Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.
TITLE Doctoral Programs in Reading: Organization and Faculty; Personnel, Facilities, and Services Supporting the Training of Reading Teachers in the United States; and Doctoral Faculties and Facilities in Reading.
PUB DATE Sep 74
NOTE 52p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v1 n2 Entire Issue Sep 1974

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Doctoral Programs; *Graduate Study; *Professional Associations; Reading; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Teacher Educator Education; Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

The "Epistle" is the publication forum of the professors of reading teacher educators a special interest group of the International Reading Association. In this issue "Doctoral Programs in Reading: Organization and Faculty," by Robert Palmatier and Anthony Manzo, reports on the results of a survey of a sample of 17 programs graduating doctorates with majors in reading; "Personnel, Facilities, and Services Supporting the Training of Reading Teachers in the United States," by Shirley Myers, A. Byron Callaway, and George Mason, surveys graduate programs in reading--especially the administrative, personnel, facilities, and service variables of 151 graduate departments offering degrees in reading; "Doctoral Faculties and Facilities in Reading: A Comment," by Richard Allington, reviews the results of these two surveys as a source of status assessment for the field of graduate training in reading. Regular features of the publication include "Exhange: Offers and Opportunities," "Movers: A Chronical of Professional Relocations," "Editorial Comment," "Time Capsule/News Notes," "New Members," and "About the Authors." (WR)

ED 098531

Vol. 1, No. 2 September, 1974

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

Doctoral Programs in Reading: Organization and Faculty 1-10
Robert A Palmatier and Anthony V. Manzo

Personnel, Facilities, and Services Supporting the Training ...11-22
of Reading Teachers in the United States
Shirley D. Myers, A. Byron Callaway, and
George E. Mason

Doctoral Faculties and Facilities in Reading: 23-28
A Comment by Richard Allington

Regular Features

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities 29-30

MOVERS: A Chronical of Professional Relocations 31-33

Editorial Comment 34

Time Capsule/News Notes 35-37

New Members 38-43

About the Authors 45-46

Next Issue

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CS 001 453

EPISTLE
VOL. 1, NO. 2

Coordinating Editor
Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri – Kansas City

Co-Editor
Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Advisory Editors
Lawrence Carrillo
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, California

H. Alan Robinson
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York

Editorial and Research Assistants
Marilyn Eanet
University of Missouri – Kansas City

Deanna Martin
University of Missouri – Kansas City

Ann Etter
University of Georgia, Athens

Correspondence: Epistle
Athony V. Manzo
School of Education
University of Missouri--Kansas City
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

Professors of Reading
Teacher Educators

Additional copies of the Epistle are available to members for one dollar, two dollars for non-members.

Printer of the Epistle is the
Johnson County Library
8700 West 63rd Street
Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66202

EPISTLE

September, 1974
Vol. 1, No. 2

Dear Colleagues:

Under this cover you will find that EPISTLE is alive and . . . ! After long and hopefully excusable delay here is the second issue. Continuing in the role of information source on doctoral programs, this issue deals with training program facilities, personnel, and services.

The initial article by Palmatier and Manzo is the first fruit of the survey suggested at the organization's initial meeting in Denver. Departmental organization, program characteristics, and faculty variables are reported for a sample of seventeen programs graduating doctorates with majors in reading.

A second article by Myers, Callaway, and Mason surveys the broader field of graduate programs in reading. Administrative, personnel, facilities, and service variables are included in this survey of 151 graduate departments offering degrees in reading.

Richard Allington, now completing his first year as a professor in a graduate reading program, looks at the results as a source of status assessment for the field of graduate training in reading.

This issue of the Epistle finds the Triple T Fellowship only a year old but already existing under a new name. The executive committee of the International Reading Association requested that our name be changed before recommending approval by the Board of Directors. Thus, as a result of this

request and through discussion at the second annual meeting in New Orleans the concept of "Triple T" will continue under the title of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators. This name, while somewhat lacking in flair, does describe the population of the Special Interest Group: persons who train (or are qualified to do so) advanced degree candidates to teach courses in the teaching of reading to pre- or in-service teachers. As a result of this change, it is expected that the IRA Board will grant approval of our request to be recognized as a Special Interest Group at their November meeting.

At the New Orleans meeting the report of the Exchange Committee resulted in an approved motion to establish a clearing house for student and faculty exchanges at Arizona State University. Full details and an application form are included in EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities, a regular feature being introduced in this issue.

Another new section to be found in this issue is MOVERS: A Chronical of Professional Relocations. This results from the memberships' indicated desire to know who has moved and who was hiring. The winter issue will begin a feature listing job openings and position seekers.

The New Orleans meeting, in addition to committee reports, resulted in election of Warren Wheelock as Secretary/Treasurer and re-election of Bob Palmatier as Chairman. Tony Manzo continues as Coordinating Editor of the EPISTLE.

An arbitrary editorial decision to conclude Volume One with the second issue makes this the final number in Volume One. Volume Two is planned to achieve the original concept of a quarterly with issues scheduled for October, January, April, and July. Future issues are planned to deal with doctoral program requirements, doctoral student characteristics,

guidance of thesis preparation, future program development, and legislation affecting training programs. Readers with any interest in these topics are urged to present manuscripts to the editors. Our friends will appreciate your helping to relieve them of our requests for articles.

Cordially,

Robert A. Palmatier

Robert A. Palmatier
Co-editor

Anthony V. Manzo
Coordinating Editor

AVM/RAP:jb

Doctoral Programs in Reading: Organization and Faculty

by

Robert A. Palmatier
University of Georgia

Anthony V. Manzo
University of Missouri at Kansas City

The initial meeting of the International Reading Association's Special Interest Group for professors involved in doctoral programs in Reading resulted in a research charge. This report is the first of four summaries of information collected in a survey of selected doctoral programs.

Sample and Procedure

Institutions reporting to have graduated three or more doctoral students in the last year reported by Stanley Wanat in GRADUATE PROGRAMS IN READING were selected for the survey. The final period included in Wanat's report was the 1971-72 academic year. The thirty-one institutions meeting the minimum criteria reported having graduated from three to 40 doctoral candidates in 1971-72. Eighteen of the institutions receiving questionnaires returned the form. All but one returning the questionnaire completed a majority of the items.

Institutions completing the questionnaire included 13 state supported universities and four private institutions. Geographic locations included representation of Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, North-Central, Midwest, and Southwest regions. As promised, no identification of specific institutions will be made.

The sample, while small, does provide a fair representation of those institutions producing the majority of new doctorates in reading. It includes both long established leaders in the field and institutions with only recently developed major programs in reading. All schools reporting offer either Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees and 12 have both available.

Responses were tallied and items related to the areas of program organization and faculty are reported in this article. Later reports will deal with program requirements, student characteristics and post-doctoral jobs, and evaluation and program goals.

Program Organization and Characteristics

All 17 institutions responded to a question on administrative aegis under which reading doctoral programs are offered. Six offer degrees through elementary education departments, four classify themselves as part of curriculum and instruction divisions, five operate within educational psychology programs, three exist as separate departments or divisions, and three report other organizational structures. The total of 21 organizational connections reported is the result of three institutions having joint association with two program areas.

Response to an item on length of time doctoral degrees with a major concentration in reading have been offered was received from sixteen schools. Two programs reported offering degrees in reading less than five years, five schools indicated programs of six to ten year vintage, one institution fell in the ten to fifteen year category, and eight schools reported sixteen or more years of offering degrees.

Specialization of degree programs in reading was stated in a variety of terms in response to an open ended question. Nine of the 15 schools responding to the question of specialization

indicated training of college professors as a priority. Eleven institutions indicated teacher training to be a major activity. Research was indicated as a program specialty by five institutions. Secondary reading emphasis was reported by three programs while college reading improvement was mentioned by only one of the reporting institutuions. Clinical training was listed by three institutions. English Education, Supervision of Reading Programs, and leadership training were also mentioned.

A forced-choice item obtained a picture of specific training areas represented as either courses and/or functions of training programs. Table 1 displays the varying emphasis of fourteen program areas across the 17 reporting institutions. Inspection of the table reveals rather even emphasis of training aspects in the areas of adult education, correlation with other learning disabilities, and junior college remedial reading. Strongest emphasis appears in the areas of elementary reading, primary reading, professional internship experiences, remedial/clinical operation, and supervision. (See Table 1 page 4)

Table 1

Training Areas and/or Functions of Doctoral Programs in Reading

Areas and/or Functions	Representation Levels		
	Strongly Represented	Represented But Not Strongly	Not Distinctly Represented
Adult Education	3	4	
College Reading Improvement	9	4	
Community Services	6	6	
Correlation with other Learning Disability Areas	5	8	
Elementary Reading Instruction	15	1	
Junior College Remedial Reading	5	3	
Primary Reading Instruction	15	3	
Professional Internship Experiences	15	1	
Remedial/Clinical Operation	15	1	
Research and Development Function	12	4	
Research Report Writing	12	4	
Secondary Content Area Reading	12	4	
Secondary School Remedial Reading	8	8	
Supervision of Reading Programs	14	3	

Faculty

The size of faculty devoted to doctoral programs in reading ranged from zero to thirteen full time staff members with one to five associated and part-time personnel. The 14 institutions reporting indicate a total of 112 faculty members involved in reading programs. When converted to full time equivalents, faculty size varies from two-and-one-half to thirteen-and-one-third with an average of six-and-two-tenths members. Of the 105 faculty members for whom degrees were specified, 68 held Ph.D.'s while 37 have Ed.D. degrees.

Age and sex of reading faculty were reported by thirteen institutions. Of the 116 faculty members for whom age ranges were given 34 fall in the 25-35 range, 45 in the 36-45 range, 29 in the 46-55 range, six in the 56-66 range, and two over 66. Thus 58% of reading faculty members are forty-five or younger. Sex was reported on only 98 faculty members: 62 male and 36 female. Five of the 15 institutions specifying sex of faculty members reported more female than male personnel. Three institutions reported male only departments while no female only faculties were reported.

A forced-choice item regarding salary of reading staff as compared with other school faculty members was completed by 16 institutions. Three departments reported slightly lower salaries, nine indicated comparable salaries, three claimed slightly higher pay, and one noted considerably higher salaries.

Another comparison of reading with other school faculty members was reported in the area of publications. None of the 17 institutions answering this item reported reading faculty publications to be less than that of other school faculty members. Eight claimed the same level of publication, and another six indicated a higher number of publications, while three reported a significantly greater number of publications for

reading faculty. When asked to indicate an average number of books and articles published per faculty member per year, 14 departments responded. Of these, one reported an average of 12; one, an average of four; six, an average of three; and six, an average of two publications. Other types of publications to which reading faculty were reported to contribute include modules, tapes, programs, evaluations, instructional materials, conference papers, reviews and newsletters.

Academic and experimental background of faculty members provided a varied picture. Table 2 reports data on years of pre-college teaching for 177 reading faculty for whom that experience was reported, and college teaching experiences for the 106 staff persons for whom those figures were reported. Pre-college teaching in excess of one year is reported for 99% of reading faculty while 65% of staff members were credited with more than five years of pre-college level teaching experience. Considerable experience in college teaching was also indicated with 60% having in excess of five years tenure as college professors.

Table 2

Years of Faculty Teaching Experiences

Level	0-1	Years of Experience			
		2-5	6-10	10+	Total
Pre-college	1	40	65	11	117
College	8	35	34	29	106

The undergraduate training background of reading faculty is primarily in the area of education. Of the 115 staff members for whom this information was reported 75 majored in Education, 18 in English, 8 in History, 10 in Psychology, 3 in Liberal Arts, and 1 in Mathematics. Graduate preparation in areas other than reading was reported for 122 faculty members. Table 3 provides a break-down by areas. Inspection of the table indicates that graduate training of reading faculty is primarily in the areas of Elementary Education, Psychology, and English Language Arts. The amount of training in reading included in degree work in these areas cannot be determined from the data available. Given earlier figures on faculty variables, it would appear that all but 10 reading faculty members hold degrees with a primary emphasis in areas other than reading. An oversight in developing the questionnaire resulted in not requesting the number of faculty members with degrees specifically in reading. Thus, the figures for other areas may have been inflated by including personnel with reading degrees in other areas.

Table 3

Areas of Faculty Graduate Training

Area	No.	Area	No.
Administration	9	Linguistics	8
Computer Science	1	Psychology	23
Counseling	2	Secondary Education	4
Curriculum	4	Special Education	2
Elementary Education	36	Statistics, Research Design	9
English Language Arts	14	Mathemetics	1
Sociology	8	Other	4

Faculty work orientation and population emphasis was also reported. Table 4 displays figures for work orientation and Table 5 itemized primary and secondary emphasis pertaining to population levels. Work orientation of faculty was dominated by graduate training, student service, research, and materials development. Pre-service training and extension service appeared to be minor emphasis areas of reading faculty. An assumption that most training in reading is done at the graduate level appears warranted from this data.

Table 4

Faculty Work Orientation

Work Area	No.	Work Area	No.
Materials Development	32	Preservice Training	29
Research	38	Graduate Training	76
Student Service	45	Other	4
Extension Service	20		

A majority of reading faculty designated elementary children as their primary population orientation. (See Table 5) The secondary level ran a distant second second with preschool, adult, college, and exceptional students receiving far smaller emphasis. The secondary work emphasis was fairly evenly distributed across all levels for the 74 faculty members reporting a second population area.

Table 5

Primary and Secondary Population Emphasis of Faculty

Level	Primary Emphasis	Secondary Emphasis
Preschool	23	8
Elementary	77	18
Secondary	33	14
Adult	19	11
College	26	13
Exceptional Student	2	10

Summary

Based on the small but representative sample reporting, program organization tended to be widely varied among institutions. All but three reading programs were reported to be under the wing of another department. Doctoral degrees with major concentration in reading had been offered by all but two of the reporting schools for more than five years. Program specialization was primarily in the area of graduate education and emphasized training for college professors, researchers, and public school specialists and supervisors. Elementary Reading Instruction, Professional Internship, Remedial/Clinical Operation, and Supervision were the most frequently reported areas of strong representation in doctoral programs.

Faculty size ranged to thirteen full-time staff members with up to five associated and part-time personnel. An average full-time equivalent of six-and-one-tenth faculty members was found across all reporting institutions. One institution claimed 13 full-time staff members. Ph.D. holders outnumber Ed.D. holders at nearly a 2:1 ratio. A generally youthful faculty is pictured with over 68% being forty-five years of age or younger. Males dominated reading faculties in overall number but females outnumber males at five of the reporting institutions.

In salary levels and publication output reading faculty members were reported to be generally equal or superior to comparable faculty in other departments. In addition to books and articles, reading faculty members contribute to a wide variety of publication formats.

Academic training at both the undergraduate and graduate levels for reading professors is most likely to be in elementary education. English and Psychology provide the next largest groups of non-reading degree holders.

If work at pre-college levels increases qualification of reading professors, the fact that nearly all faculty members had considerable teaching experience must be considered a plus.

Faculty work orientation in rank order was reported to emphasize graduate training, student service, research, and materials development. Nearly half of the faculty reported primary emphasis to elementary reading, with secondary, college and adult levels running a distant second.

Organization of reading departments cannot be easily generalized upon but faculty characteristics appear more consistent. The results of the above reported survey illustrate strongly qualified departments offering doctoral programs. A few training areas receive great emphasis while a number of others receive only limited attention. Hopefully, knowing the areas of reported strengths and weaknesses will allow evaluation and redirection where needs appear.

Personnel, Facilities and Services Supporting the Training of Reading Teachers in the United States

by

Shirley D. Myers
A. Byron Callaway
George E. Mason

University of Georgia

In the United States there are a large number of institutions offering graduate programs for the training of reading teachers. From their own experience the authors knew that the personnel, facilities and services available for this training varied from one institution to another. Some information was available from GRADUATE PROGRAMS AND FACULTY IN READING (Wanat, 1973), but only enough to provide an interested reader with guesses about the facilities and support for the programs listed. Consequently, a survey was undertaken in an attempt to determine the nature of the institutions and the departments by which the reading programs were offered. The survey also was an attempt to determine support for the program in terms of services performed, facilities available, and faculty activities supported by the institution.

The survey instrument was a questionnaire devised by two of the authors and mailed to all colleges of 3,000 or more enrollment, according to the WORLD ALMANAC. Questionnaires were also sent to institutions known to have an instructional program in Reading Education; even though the

institution had less than 3,000 students. A total of 300 questionnaires were mailed and the response was just over fifty percent.

While 151 forms were returned, some items or areas were left blank and other completed in great detail; and since raw scores were sometimes more meaningful than percentages, both were reported to clarify the points investigated.

Size of the Institutions Surveyed

Responses came from a wide variety of institutions. Most respondent schools offered both undergraduate and graduate opportunities for their students. Some schools offered specialized services and some reported no courses to develop reading skills. The table below indicates the size of the schools surveyed.

Table 1

Total Enrollments of Students

Number of Students	1 5,000	5,001 10,000	10,001 15,000	15,001 30,000	30,001 plus
Percent	19	34	21	23	13

The range of enrollments indicated by 130 respondents was from 94 to 33,000 students. The next two tables represent the graduate and the undergraduate enrollment in the schools surveyed. The total response to these items was not as high as the total enrollment of students.

Table 2

Graduate Enrollments

Number of Students	1 1,000	1,001 2,000	2,001 3,000	3,001 4,000	4,001 5,000	5,001 plus
Percent	32	26	10	19	19	14

The range of enrollments reported by 112 respondents was from 34 to 17,000 students.

Table 3

Undergraduate Enrollments

Number of Students	1 4,000	4,001 8,000	8,001 12,000	12,000 plus
Percent	21	45	25	10

The range of enrollments reported by 100 respondents was from 60 to 23,000 students.

Departments and Staff

A variety of single divisions and multiple combinations which offered reading instruction were reported. In some instances, the same departments were not teaching both graduate and undergraduate courses. Some of the single departments and combinations which were reported only once or twice were: Special Education and English; Special Education and Elementary Education; Special Education, Elementary Education and Guidance; Reading and Special Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Educational Psychology; Reading and English; Communication Skills; Reading and Curriculum; Special Programs; Reading and Elementary Education; Reading, Elementary and Secondary Education; and Guidance and Educational Psychology. The most frequently reported department names are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Distribution of Names of Departments Teaching Reading Courses in Percents

	Reading	Elementary Education	Elementary & Sec. Ed.	Curriculum & Instruction
Teaching Undergraduates	20	32	29	19
Teaching Graduates	29	25	22	24

Responses related to undergraduate and graduate instruction indicate that four types of departments are involved in developing reading courses. The Reading Department was only the third most frequently named department offering reading courses. .

Because of the varying inclusiveness of the responding departments, the number of professors reported ranged from 1 to 200 with a mean of 18. Many of the teachers enumerated were probably not directly involved in the teaching of reading. The mean number of professors reported by Reading Departments was 6. The number of graduate assistants ranged from 0 to 39 with a mean of 7. About one-third of reporting schools had no graduate assistants to aid with instruction, clinical services, or research. The mean number of graduate assistants available to Reading Departments was 5.

The percents of respondents reporting faculties and graduate assistants in several numerical size categories are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Percents Faculty and Graduate Assistants
Numerical Size Categories

Number	0	1-10	11-20	21-30	Over 30
Faculty %	–	49	27	11	13
Assistants %	33	57	08	02	–

Degrees and Services

The masters degree was the offering most frequently reported. One-hundred and nine of 121 responding colleges reported that they offered it. Thirty-nine offered the doctorate while fifty-two offered the Educational Specialist, C.A.S., or sixth-year degree. Sixteen reported offering a bachelors degree with a speciality in reading and six reported that they offered no degree specializing in reading. The majority of the 121 reporting colleges offer more than one reading related degree, allowing students the opportunity to advance toward a higher degree within the specialized area of reading. The raw numbers reporting each combination of degree programs is shown in Table 6.

Table 6

Numbers of Colleges Offering Various Combinations of Degrees with Specialization in Reading

No Degree	Doctorate & Masters	Bachelors only	Masters only	Specialist only	Doctorate Masters Specialist	Bachelors Masters	Bachelors Masters Doctorate Specialist
6	11	6	40	24	24	6	4

Table 7 reports the number of colleges and universities operating clinics, whether they charge for services, and whether opportunities for observation are provided. While most reporting clinics charged for diagnosis, the reverse was indicated for charges for teaching services. However, the number responding to the question about charges was not large enough to give an adequate picture of those clinics reported, to say nothing of those not reported.

Table 7

Clinical and Teaching Services

	Operates Clinic	Charges for Diagnosis	Provide for Observation	Charges for Teaching
Number Responding	61	20	32	12
Percentage "Yes"	67	77	81	35

The number diagnosed in the 61 clinics ranged from fifteen to 250 pupils a year with a mean of 103. The range of pupils taught yearly in the thirty-six responding clinics was from ten to 559 with a mean of 109. Table 8 reports the data.

Table 8

Clients Diagnosed and Taught in Clinics

	0 20	21 40	41 60	61 80	81 100	101 120	121 140	141 160	161 180	181 200	200 +
Diagnosed Yearly	4	2	7	4	4	2	3	6	1	1	1
Taught Yearly	4	7	3	8	3	2	3	—	—	5	3

Research and Conference Support

In seeking to determine how well departments were supporting research for reading staff members, responses to several items were requested. The responses are reported in Table 9. The overall response to these items was high and fairly consistent in numbers responding. The results indicate that in the majority of cases faculty members and staff carried their own expenses for researching and reporting findings and used their own free time for conducting their research. (See Table 9)

Table 10 indicates the support offered for attending professional conferences. The numbers of responses is not consistently high. The data indicates that about three-fourths of the responding colleges do provide some support to faculty members for attending professional conferences. About fifty percent of the colleges support attendance at more than one convention. State and national conventions appeared to receive the most support from reporting colleges. It appears that the presentation of a paper is not usually prerequisite to support for conference expenses. (See Table 10)

Table 9
Support for Research

	Sponsors Research	Buys Tests	Pays Research	Pays for Scoring	Provides Computer	Provides for Coding	Provides Research Assistants	Pays for Publishing Articles
Number Responding	130	132	130	132	133	127	131	142
Percentage "Yes"	40	37	25	31	38	33	21	11

Table 10
Conference Expenses

	Pays Some Expenses	Pays All Expenses	Pays for State Convention	Pays When a Participant Only	Pays for National Convention	Pays for Regional Convention	Pays for More than One Convention
Number Responding	136	95	93	65	95	84	126
Percentage "Yes"	79	18	71	46	76	68	44

Of 141 colleges responding, 41 percent indicated that they did sponsor a reading conference, while 59 percent did not. Reading Departments were not different from others in conference sponsorship. Thirty-nine percent of the colleges which reported having Reading Departments sponsored conferences. In colleges where reading courses were developed in departments not specifically labeled Reading, forty-four percent sponsored reading conferences.

Independent library support services within the teaching departments are indicated in Table Eleven. Numbers of responses to each item are high and fairly consistent. The responses indicated that the departmental library is considered a vital part of reading instruction. Audio-visual materials were the only types of resources which were not almost universally available.

The question of whether the central college libraries had collections supporting departmental libraries was not asked.

(See Table 11 p.21)

Table 11

Library Resources

	Department Library Available	Reference Held by Department	Teaching Materials Held	Demonstrations Held	Audio-Visual Materials Held	Test File Available
Number Responding	144	139	142	138	138	132
Percentage "Yes"	94	94	94	93	77	88

Of 138 responses to the question of whether secretarial services were provided, only 77 percent indicated that services were available.

Summary

The results of the survey reveal that college departments that train reading specialists are not particularly well supported financially. While most of the programs for training reading teachers have departmental library services available, not all do and nearly one-fourth lack secretarial services. About a third (probably the same as those without secretarial help) have no teaching or research assistants while others have sufficient numbers of assistants to create a mean of seven. One hundred nine reported offering the masters degree in reading or the masters degree with a specialization in reading, yet only forty reported that they operated a clinic and not all of these provided clinical observation facilities. The majority could provide no help to faculty in conducting or reporting research. While most could support some attendance at conventions of professional associations, most did not support all convention expense. It is therefore clear that the state of the profession of training reading teachers appears to need better financing.

It is true that the survey was not completed and returned by many organizations and also that the returned survey forms were not completely filled out by many respondents. However, it appears likely that the schools and departments which were less well supported are the majority of those who did not respond. Therefore, the conclusions appear valid.

Doctoral Faculties and Facilities in Reading: A Comment

Richard Allington

State University of New York at Albany

After reviewing the two previous survey summaries many readers may rejoice at the advantages offered by their present position, others may develop inferiority complexes, but many will presumably react as this reader did; while the situation often seems dreary there are a multitude of other in the same boat. A small comfort!

Given the limitations of any survey instrument, the previous summaries offer a wealth of information about the status of doctoral faculties programs. Unfortunately, descriptive information is not necessarily valuable in and of itselt. Like the information gained from a diagnostic workup, survey data must be examined in light of possible recommendations toward improvement of the status quo.

To begin, one might question why only a little more than 50% of the institutions solicited responded. Then too, one could and should question the generalizability of the results. However, authors of both summaries accept the results as valid and for the remainder of the following discussion the same assumption will be adhered to, even though caution need be observed.

Program Organization

There seems to be no common organizational structure for reading faculties. Both summaries point to a variety of organizations with a separate Reading Department or Division

being the exception rather than the rule. There are, of course, arguments both for and against separated and integrated faculty organizational structures. One might consider the problem of a reading faculty integrated within a larger more general structure such as an Elementary Education department. Does this structure limit course offerings? Or can one offer adult or secondary reading courses through an Elementary Education department? Are there restrictions in this type of organizational structure that lead to program bias? Are reading faculty generalists? Is equitable support available for reading faculty and programs buried in myriad?

On the other hand, it might be argued that a separate and distinct unit of faculty under the label 'Reading Department' encourages a relatively narrow view of education. However, such an organizational pattern does allow faculty increased decision making autonomy and increased control over the purse strings (even though the purse may contain limited resources). While the survey data are descriptive, they are not evaluative and as such it perhaps raise more queries than it answers. The data, unfortunately, do not allow one to recommend any particular pattern of organization.

Program Emphasis

The indicated overemphasis on elementary school reading is probably a function of the law of supply and demand. With most states requiring a minimum of one course in reading for prospective elementary teachers, it seems logical for reading faculty involved in training college teachers to focus on the area in which a majority of the employment opportunities exist. However, the data while indicating lesser emphasis in the areas of adult reading, secondary reading, and correlated learning disabilities, do not present a clear picture of the efforts in these fields. While receiving a secondary emphasis generally, these areas need to receive primary emphasis in certain graduate

programs. The point is that the data do not clearly indicate whether these areas are the strengths of certain institutions and thus receive primary emphasis in a limited number of programs, or whether they receive primary emphasis from individual faculty members at institutions where they simultaneously receive minimal institutional emphasis. While many institutions offer a single course in each of these areas, it seems desirable for certain institutions to concentrate their research and training emphasis in adult reading, secondary reading, or correlated learning disabilities. While not recommending the development of programs of limited scope, the data do seem to indicate that few institutions have the faculty resources available to support strong programs in even half of the 14 areas reported in Table 1 of the Palmatier and Manzo survey. Thus it seems more appropo that the majority of doctoral programs select a few areas for concentration of efforts in the development of effective training programs in these less popular, but still important areas. No program should try to be everything to everyone.

College Teaching and Teacher Training

A majority of the respondents in the Palmatier and Manzo summary identified training of college teachers and teacher training as priority tasks or specialties. However, pre-service teacher training and extension service received a contradiction. If reading faculty is not deeply involved in the development and refinement of pre-service training programs, how then do they train college teachers? Training for college teaching has long been a neglected aspect of most doctoral programs. Teaching assistants often receive experience but seldom training or evaluation other than at a most cursory level. Do the data provided support this tradition? Little else can be assumed from the data.

The low priority of extension service would seem to be another area of concern for graduate faculties in reading. Is the "Ivory

tower" the norm within most institutions responding? While a surprisingly high percentage of faculty had 2+ years experience in lower level education, is 3 years of elementary school teaching ten years past still a valid criterion? Do faculty members truly have a grasp of the functions and problems of teaching in this decade? If they have not used a method or material, can they honestly expect to train teachers in its implementation? The survey data seem to point to a distinct need for graduate faculty to be involved in the real world of classrooms. But given the other data, who will provide the support necessary in terms of released time? Or is expecting teacher trainers to be able to operate in a public school classroom asking too much?

Faculty and Facilities

The piece of data that seems most interesting under faculty qualifications and training in the Palmatier and Manzo report is that 105 of 112 faculty members, for whom the data were provided, held a doctorate. The Meyer, Callaway, and Mason report does not provide this information for their sample, but the above ratio may be a bit high even when considering only faculty involved in doctoral programs and considerably above reality for graduate programs at the Master's and Specialist level.

While the surveys provide insights into quantity, little can be gleaned in terms of the quality of the faculties from the information provided. Neither sheer number of faculty, nor numbers of earned doctorates are accurate gauges of quality.

Only 61 of 151 institutions returning the Myers, Callaway, Mason survey responded to the question on operation of clinics. Approximately 40 of these institutions indicated a clinic was available for teacher training. This leads one to conclude that from 25% to 66% of the surveyed institutions have a clinic

operating. Hopefully, the percentage is higher for institutions offering graduate degrees, even though a clinic which provides opportunities for practice, observation, and evaluation would be a desirable component for all programs, including undergraduate. One should seriously question the quality of teacher training programs without clinical experience.

Of further interest would be information on funding of clinical operations and the dollar value of clinical services rendered to the respective communities. Also, of interest would be information on teaching loads, especially in clinic and practicum courses.

Reading faculty generally have resource materials available, but the extent of these are in question. Should we believe that most faculties have adequate monies to supply resources centers and professional libraries? Or are these resource rooms stocked through the good will of many commercial publishing firms who graciously supply sample materials?

As before, the survey data may raise more issues than it resolves. Clinical, teaching, and library (or resource) services would each seem necessary for effective teacher training. Resources vary considerably but improvement in each area would seem to be a logical requirement in strengthening any teacher training program.

Research and Conference Support

Monetary support for the research and conference areas of professional growth seems limited. While the data again varies considerably there are strong indications that much of the research efforts faculties expend seem to, in the old expression, be taken from one's own hide. Travel to professional conferences is provided minimal support, generally less than full compensation for more than one excursion per year. Given

these pieces of information one might infer that support of doctoral students involved in similar undertakings is nigh onto non-existent.

When one stops to consider the sheer number of valid professional conferences available and number of research questions unanswered, we again find areas in which considerable improvement, in terms of monetary support, could be made.

Summary

Interested readers will probably draw their own comparisons and conclusions. However, each of you might examine the data and analyze the program in which you may be involved. Would a reorganization facilitate your training efforts? Not a simple change of name or the creation of a new course or experience, but rather a thorough examination of the program as now constituted. Is the current program developing graduates for today's and tomorrow's worlds? Does it provide faculty with necessary opportunities and experiences for professional growth? The status quo is not necessarily bad, but generally it can be improved. The survey results seem to indicate a need for redirection of efforts in some cases and redoubling of efforts in others.

EXCHANGE: Offers and Opportunities

Need a change for a semester or quarter? Have a doctoral student who desires a work experience not available in your program? Curious about how your doctoral students compare with those from other universities? Or maybe you would like a trial period in a different climate area. Any of these desires are sufficient reason for contacting PRTE's Exchange Clearinghouse.

In this issue of EPISTLE we are pleased to introduce the concept of a clearinghouse for faculty and graduate student exchanges. The clearinghouse will function as a collector and disseminator of information concerning persons who wish to exchange positions with their peers. In each future issue information about individuals wishing to make temporary exchanges will be published. Contacts between those interested in exchanges will then be up to the individuals involved. Neither the EPISTLE, PRTE, nor the Clearinghouse at Arizona State can be responsible for making final agreements between parties wishing to undertake an exchange. We can tell you where the ballparks are but must leave arranging and playing the game up to you.

If you are interested in an exchange contact:

Dr. Ernest Dishner
Reading Center
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

A form for putting your name into the Clearinghouse pool is printed here for your convenience. Others are available from Dr. Dishner. When your form is received you will be sent an up-to-date listing of other "exchangers". Your information will, if you desire, also be printed in the next issue of the EPISTLE.

STUDENT AND FACULTY EXCHANGE FORM

Professors of Reading Teacher Educators-International Reading Association

NAME: _____
Last First Middle

POSITION: _____ _____
Title Institution

SPECIALIZATION: _____

	OFFICE	HOME
ADDRESS:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
PHONE:	_____	_____

	INSTITUTION	DEGREE	DATE
EDUCATION	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

	TITLE	LOCATION	DATES
PRIOR WORK:	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

	TYPE OF POSITION YOU WISH	DUTIES REQUIRED OF YOUR REPLACEMENT
EXCHANGE:	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

WHEN: _____ _____
Year Quarter or Semester Exchange Desired

OTHER COMMENTS: _____

_____

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

MOVERS: A Chronicle of Professional Relocations

Trying to keep up with faculty moves is often a problem. MOVERS will endeavor to keep you posted as to placement of new graduates and relocation of veterans. Send names and new professional locations to be published to Bob Palmatier, 309 Aderhold Building, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601.

NEW GRADS

. . .from University of Maryland

Jane Matanzo, Assistant Professor
Hood College, Frederick, Maryland

Ann Neal, Assistant Professor
Federal City College, Washington, D.C.

Portia Shields, Assistant Professor
Howard University, Washington, D.C.

. . .from Florida State University

David Alexander, Assistant Professor
Massachusetts State College, Worchester, Massachusetts

Patricino Gamelo, State Department
of Education, Manilla, Phillipines

Elizabeth Martin, Assistant Professor
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee

Barbara Palmer, Assistant Professor
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

Carole Stice, Assistant Professor
Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee

. . .from University of Georgia

Ola M. Brown, Assistant Professor
Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Georgia

Patricia Brown, Assistant Professor
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio

Louis Call, Assistant Professor
Russell Sage College, Troy New York

Linda Mixon Clary, Assistant Professor
Augusta College, Augusta, Georgia

Nancy Porcher, Assistant Professor
Armstrong State College, Savannah, Georgia

Larry J. Salmon, Assistant Professor
Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia

Susan J. Smith, Assistant Professor
Nicholls State University, Thibodaus, Louisiana

Rob Tierney, Assistant Professor
University of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona

. . . from Arizona State University, Tempe

John Colligan, Assistant Professor
Madison College, Harrisonburg

Lance Gentile, Associate Professor
Pan American University, Edinburg, Texas

Brenda Beal, Assistant Professor
University of California at Humboldt, Humboldt, California

. . . from Syracuse University

Doris Halliwell, Assistant Professor
New Rochelle College, New Rochelle, New York

Linda Lamme, Assistant Professor
University of Florida, Gainseville, Florida

Jack Burtch, Assistant Professor
Slippery Rock Teacher's College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania

Anita Corey, Assistant Professor
Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia

Jon Shapiro, Assistant Professor
State University of New York at Fredonia, Fredonia, New York

Robert Lemons, Assistant Professor
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama

. . . from State University of New York at Albany

Jerry Niles, Assistant Professor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia

Etta Miller, Assistant Professor
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas

Joseph Fusaro, Assistant Professor
University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania

. . . from the University of Missouri – Kansas City
Victor Culver, Assistant Professor
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Editorial Comment

Time and events march on. Reading jobs are still unfilled while the teacher surplus grows. State Legislators are overnight expanding school and college reading programs. Vocational schools and junior colleges continue to build expanded compensatory reading units. The points of emphasis may be changing but reading grads still enter an active and largely seller controlled job market.

Doctoral level jobs are still available too. In MOVERS note that partial listings from six institutions show the placement of 28 new grads. The record in our informal tally goes to Madison College for adding three of those listed to their staff.

Right To Read continues to age of chronic underfunding. Tell your congressmen to attend to the reading bills now that they are out of the Watergate swamp. To learn more about future Right To Read milestones look to your state department as that is where increasing amounts of federal dollar investments are headed. Also brace yourself for a new wave of funded volunteer tutor programs. . ."tutoring academies" in Right to Read jargon.

Innovation in the training of reading teachers continues. The module craze of recent years has come of age in the modularized textbook. Field-based instruction is the new fad in quest of the ultimate in competency based training. We understand a growing demand now exists for authors of field-based texts. Seems neigh onto impossible to separate reading from books. . .even textbooks.

Summer a time of respite for weary educators? Not from what we hear from instructors of graduate reading courses. Record numbers of teachers are coming back to find out how to cope with reading problems, especially secondary teachers. How about a winter vacation this year?

RAP

For the Time Capsule . . . (September, 1974)

The resignation of Richard M. Nixon under threat of impeachment transpired too quickly once started. Seeing it live made it seem inconsequential and old before the evening edition, yet we sense a peculiar emotional lag. This may explain man's fascination with history. Events which took place during a coffee break can be digested for years afterwards.

The answer to the 'will he resign?' question has dutifully raised its own new query: Can a square peg fit in an oval hole? President Gerald Ford took office to the sound of damnable faint praise. His brother gulped(!) and said, "Jerry is stable and conscious; and, he was a hellava football player, too." Nonetheless, we must admit that we like him. The President is definitely frank, apparently courageous and, we suspect, brighter than anyone is currently giving him credit for: Rocky in the bank, amnesty one way or another; pardon before indictment. . .although the latter is threatening to turn Fordian Frankness into Fjordian Frankness.

The Media. Or down the Down Staircase. The fall T.V. season is a welcome break from (Repeat). Almost no one denies the role of T.V. in their lives anymore. We are already looking forward to the mid-year entries which promise the ultimate audience grabber: a female detective of mixed black and Greek descent, who is obese, lame and dyslexic. But these are not her situation handicaps, it's her name – Christie Kodjak Cannonside. She wears a gamey raincoat, lives in a trailer, and is obsessed with afternoon reruns of the Beverly Hillbillies. Do you suppose T.V. guides will ever have shows marked (Replication)? There is talk of a Brand (as in cereal) new concept in game shows, "Cretin-Give-Away"; no questions, no conversation, just a male Bobbie doll with 10 extra teeth who tries to give away money – without personal injury to himself – to odd objects jumping

with pre-adolescent delight. Media trends of another kind are also crystallizing. There is a surge in the popularity of "Pop" and speciality magazines. PSYCHOLOGY TODAY and NEW TIMES must be called successes in the first category, and WOMEN'S SPORTS and several food magazines in the second. Anticipate mags for unemployed soothsayers and professors of reading teacher educators. In books, Fiction is "caught up on a tin roof" (if you know that joke) – it has been about 18 months since a pure fiction book has been the best seller. Jimmy Breslin may soon correct that. But even WORLD WITHOUT END, AMEN seems more like the "New Journalism" than fiction . . . or is the "new Journalism" merely fiction(?).

For those who care, changes in football rules seem to have neutralized the defense, energized the offense, and re-instituted the Bomb. At least during pre-season.

Contrarywise, the loom of doom and the speed of change which have kept us alternately in anxiety and shock since 1960 seems to be abating: Vietbomb is (temporarily?) defused; the counter-culturists have passed mental age 16; we are getting used to having our electronic living room guest embarrass us with talk of feminine deodorant problems and the irregularity of old age; we are coming to accept inflation as a luxury problem and part of daily life; no one can say that integration is really working, but no one can say that it isn't; and the 55 MPH speed limit stands as a ubiquitous sign (73% of the populace support it) covering the American landscape with our wish to just incubate.

Another kind of incubation is bringing relief after a long period of consumer dismay. There are young, BRIGHT, articulate, people showing up in the darnest places: as automechanics, plumbers, gardners, and such. The reasons for their appearances may be a mixed blessing, but half a blessing – to counter with a mixed metaphor – is sweeter than none.

Do you remember when dieffenbachia, coleus and begonias were the property of spinster-school teachers? Why I've got a wax begonia that I wouldn't trade for an economy car.

AVM

News Notes:

We have articles coming up by Emmett Betts, Helen Robinson, Thomas Estes, Edward Smith, H. Alan Robinson, Robert Christina, and Jaap Tuinman.

The National Reading Conference is meeting is Kansas City, Missouri on December 2–4. We have it on the best authority that this will be a sensational conference. Kansas City is now ranked among the top speciality restaurant towns in USA. Senator Thomas Eagleton will be a guest speaker. Edward Fry (Rutger's University) is chief conference chairman.

Hal Herber and Joan Nelson are now Drs. Harold and Joan Herber. Our warmest congratulations.

Late News Note:

Title VII the National Reading Improvement Program – promises to put $30,000,000 into the improvement of reading instruction in 1974–75 – like NOW! Priority 2 is to provide assistance in "development and enhancement of necessary skills of instructional staff . . ." We thank Dr. Sterl Artley for this reminder. Senator Eagleton will be discussing this act at NRC.

NEW MEMBERS

Dr. Richard Allington
State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

Dr. Mark Aulls
136D Barton Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. Allen Berger
Department of Elementary Education
The University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T6G 2G5

Dr. Mary M. Brittain
University of Madison – Wisconsin
6217 Pidemont Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53711

Dr. N. Dale Bryant
Columbia University
1230 Amsterdam Apt. 911
New York, New York 10027

Dr. Richard W. Burnett
University of Missouri – St. Louis
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Dr. Jeanne Chall
School of Education
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Edna P. DeHaven
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Oregon
H-55 35th Avenue W.
Eugene, Oregon 97405

Dr. Elias H. Wiebe
Pacific College
1717 South Chestnut
Fresno, California 93702

Dr. Joan T. Feeley
Paterson College
300 Pompton Road
Wayne, New Jersey 07470

Dr. James T. Fleming
State University of New York
at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

Dr. J. Eugene Fletcher
Eastern Washington College
Cheney, Washington 99004

Dr. Flora C. Fower
East Tennessee St. University
E T S U Campus
Johnson City, Tennessee

Dr. Mary E. Harshbarger
TC 309
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47305

Dr. Peter Hasselriis
215 Education Building
University of Missouri – Columbia
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Dr. Margaret Keyser Hill
Southern Illinois University
Wham Bldg. Room 226
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Dr. Daniel R. Hittleman
Department of Education
Queens College of the City
University of New York
Flushing, New York 11367

Dr. Robert A. Kaiser
Memphis State University
6490 Sulgrave Drive
Memphis, Tennessee 38138

Dr. James E. Kerber
Ohio State University
201 Arps Hall
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Karl Koenke
305 Education Building
University of Illinois – Urbana
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Dr. Janet B. Kuenne
New York University
School of Education
Department of Educational Psychology
933 Shimkin Hall
New York, New York 10003

Dr. Robert E. Leibert
University of Missouri Kansas City
Division of Reading Education
School of Education, UMKC
Kansas City, Missouri 64110

Dr. George Mason
Reading Department
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dr. Nancy J. Nichols
Bacon Hall 321 F
State University College at
Buffalo
1300 Elmwood Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14222

Dr. William Oehlkers
Rhode Island College
600 Mt. Pleasant
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Dr. Wallace Ramsey
University of Missouri – St. Louis
14 Meadowbrook
Ballwin, Missouri 63011

Dr. Mary Luke Reiland (Sister)
Loyela–Marymount University
7101 West 80th Street
Los Angeles, California 90045

Dr. H. Alan Robinson
School of Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, Long Island, New York

Dr. Robert R. Schmatz
Univeristy of Wisconsin
Stevens Point
457 COPS
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54418

Dr. Hazel Simpson
309 Aderhold Building
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Dr. Phyllis W. Smith
Clarion State College
Clarion, Pennsylvania 16412

Dr. Zelda Smith
N. Kentucky State College
Highland Heights, Kentucky 41076

Dr. Jo M. Stanchfield
Occidental College
1600 Campus Road
Los Angeles, California 90041

Dr. John M. Taylor
East Tennessee State University
Box 2446, E.T.S.U.
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601

Dr. Taylor E. Turner
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

Dr. Edna Warncke
Teachers College 316
Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana 47306

Dr. David C. Waterman
Indiana State University
322 Stalker Hall
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Dr. Agnes A. Manney
University of Cincinnati
274 Senator Place, No9
Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert A. Palmatier (Ph.D., Syracuse University, 1968) is an associate professor of Reading Education at the University of Georgia. In addition to serving as chairman of PRTE, Dr. Palmatier is President of the Northeast Georgia Council of the IRA. At the University he specializes in secondary reading, directs a Right To Read Community Based Project, and advises doctoral candidates.

Anthony V. Manzo (Ph.D., Syracuse University, 1969) served as the first secretary/treasurer of PRTE and continues as Coordinating Editor of EPISTLE. As an associate professor at the University of Missouri at Kansas City, Dr. Manzo directs the college reading program, teaches graduate courses, and advises doctoral candidates. He has been active in a variety of adult and secondary school education projects.

Shirley D. Myers (Ed.D., University of Georgia, 1967) as an assistant professor at the University of Georgia serves as the reading department's representative to the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service. Thus, Dr. Myers spends the majority of her time teaching field based courses and graduate in-service classes.

A. Byron Callaway (Ed.D., University of Missouri, 1951) is Professor of Reading Education and Director of the Reading Clinic at the University of Georgia. Dr. Callaway advises several doctoral candidates each year in addition to his reading clinic and teaching responsibilities.

George E. Mason (Ph.D., Syracuse University, 1963) is Professor of Reading Education and Head of the Reading Department at the University of Georgia. In addition to administrative and teaching duties, Dr. Mason advises doctoral candidates, specializes in beginning reading, and writes high interest – low readability books (Allyn and Bacon).

Richard Allington (Ph.D., Michigan State University, 1973) teaches graduate reading courses, including a clinical practicum in diagnosis and remediation, as an Assistant Professor at the State University of New York at Albany. Dr. Allington is a past winner of an IRA Distinguished Dissertation award. He is currently co-authoring a book on secondary reading.